

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)

Westgate Communications LLC d/b/a WeavTel)
Petition for Waiver of Sections 69.2(hh) and 69.601)
of the Commission's Rules)

WC Docket No. 05-58

Beaver Creek Telephone Company Petition for)
Waiver of Sections 69.2(hh) and 69.601)
of the Commission's Rules)

WC Docket No. 05-69

AUG 15 2005

ORDER

Adopted: August 11, 2005

Released: August 11, 2005

By the Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In this Order, we grant the requests of Westgate Communications LLC d/b/a WeavTel (WeavTel) and Beaver Creek Telephone Company (Beaver Creek) for waiver of sections 69.2(hh) and 69.601 of the Commission's rules. We also grant WeavTel and Beaver Creek waivers of the definition of incumbent local exchange carrier (LEC) in Part 36 and section 54.5 of the Commission's rules to the limited extent necessary to permit them to receive universal service support based on their own costs. These waivers will permit WeavTel and Beaver Creek to be treated as incumbent LECs for the purposes of receiving universal service support and participating in National Exchange Carriers Association (NECA) tariffs and pools. We also grant the requests of WeavTel and Beaver Creek for waiver of certification and data filing deadlines contained in Part 54 of the Commission's rules. Specifically, we waive the October 1, 2004 data filing deadline set forth in section 54.301(b) of the Commission's rules for local switching support (LSS), the October 1, 2004 deadline set forth in section 54.314(d) of the Commission's rules for state certification of support for rural carriers, and the March 31, 2005 and July 31, 2005 data filing deadlines set forth in section 54.903(a) of the Commission's rules for interstate common line support (ICLS). These waivers will ensure that WeavTel and Beaver Creek are able to collect access charges and universal service funding in a timely manner. Based on the record, we find that all of these waivers are in the public interest because they will facilitate the ability of WeavTel and Beaver Creek to serve previously unserved areas.

II. BACKGROUND

A. WeavTel

2. On August 18, 2004, WeavTel filed a petition requesting a waiver of sections 69.2(hh) and 69.601 of the Commission's rules.¹ WeavTel is a LEC formed under the laws of the state of Washington

¹ Westgate Communications LLC d/b/a WeavTel Petition for Waiver of Sections 69.2 and 69.601 of the Commission's Rules, WC Docket No. 05-58 (filed August 18, 2004) (WeavTel Petition); Public Notice, 20 FCC (continued....)

in 1996.² WeavTel states that it is constructing a new local telephone exchange to serve a previously unserved area in and around the town of Stehekin in Chelan County, Washington.³ It explains that, in 2001, the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (WUTC) asked if any telephone company were interested in providing local exchange service in this previously unserved area and ultimately selected WeavTel as the service provider.⁴ WeavTel asserts that its proposed service area never has been included in the local exchange service territory or study area of Verizon, the adjacent incumbent LEC.⁵ The WUTC determined that WeavTel will be the only LEC serving this area, and it designated WeavTel as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier (ETC) for the proposed Stehekin exchange.⁶

3. WeavTel would like to join NECA “in order to minimize its administrative expenses and maintain stable access rates.”⁷ It states that its intended customer base of approximately 93 access lines is too small to support the expenses associated with preparing, filing, and maintaining its own interstate access tariff.⁸ Additionally, WeavTel asserts that it will be unable to maintain stable access rates “if certain critical expenses or demand factors fluctuated significantly.”⁹ WeavTel explains that it is unable to join NECA and participate in NECA tariffs and pools because sections 69.601(a) and 69.2(hh) of the Commission’s rules limit NECA’s membership to incumbent LECs, as defined in section 251(h)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (the Act).¹⁰ Thus, WeavTel seeks waiver of these rules in order to become a member of NECA and participate in NECA tariffs and pools.¹¹

4. On May 13, 2005, WeavTel filed a letter in this proceeding stating its intent to seek federal universal service support, and requesting waiver of any sections of Parts 36 and 54 of the Commission’s rules necessary for it to be treated as an incumbent LEC for the purposes of imposing access charges and

(Continued from previous page)

Rcd 4379 (WCB 2005). No comments or reply comments were filed in response to WeavTel’s petition.

² See WeavTel Petition at 1.

³ See *id.*

⁴ See *id.* at 2.

⁵ See *id.* at 3.

⁶ See *id.* at 2-3.

⁷ See *id.* at 5.

⁸ See *id.*

⁹ See *id.* at 4.

¹⁰ See *id.* at 1. Section 69.601(a) of the Commission’s rules states that NECA “shall be established in order to prepare and file access charge tariffs on behalf of all *telephone companies*.” See 47 C.F.R. § 69.601(a) (emphasis added). “Telephone company” is defined in section 69.2(hh) of the Commission’s rules as “an incumbent LEC as defined in section 251(h) of the 1934 Act as amended by the 1996 Act.” 47 C.F.R. 69.2(hh). Section 251(h)(1) of the Act defines an “incumbent LEC” as a provider of telephone exchange service and a member of NECA on the date of enactment of the 1996 Act, or a successor or assign of such an entity. See 47 U.S.C. § 251(h)(1).

¹¹ See WeavTel Petition at 1.

receiving federal universal service support.¹² WeavTel also requested waiver of certification and data filing deadlines contained in Part 54 of the Commission's rules that would prevent it from beginning to receive high cost loop, local switching, or interstate common line support on the date on which it would otherwise be entitled to receive such support.¹³

B. Beaver Creek

5. On December 8, 2004, Beaver Creek filed a petition requesting a waiver of sections 69.2(hh) and 69.601 of the Commission's rules.¹⁴ Beaver Creek states that it is a new local exchange carrier formed for the purpose of serving previously unserved areas in the state of Washington. Beaver Creek states that it is constructing two new local telephone exchanges. One proposed exchange is expected to serve approximately 62 access lines in and around the town of Silverton in Snohomish County, Washington, within five years after commencing operations.¹⁵ The other proposed exchange is expected to serve approximately 59 access lines in the Devil's Club area of King County, Washington, within five years after commencing operations.¹⁶ Beaver Creek states that it is authorized by the WUTC to offer basic telecommunications services to these currently unserved areas and that neither proposed exchange has ever been included in the local exchange service plan of the adjacent incumbent LEC.¹⁷

6. Like WeavTel, Beaver Creek would like to participate in NECA tariffs and pools in order to "minimize its administrative expenses and maintain stable interstate access rates."¹⁸ It states that its intended customer base of approximately 121 access lines is too small to support the expenses associated with preparing, filing, and maintaining its own interstate access tariff.¹⁹ Beaver Creek asserts that it will be unable to maintain stable access rates "if certain critical expenses or demand factors fluctuated significantly."²⁰ Beaver Creek explains that it is unable to join NECA and participate in NECA tariffs and pools because sections 69.601(a) and 69.2(hh) of the Commission's rules limit NECA's membership to incumbent LECs as defined in section 251(h)(1) of the Act. Thus, Beaver Creek seeks waiver of these rules in order to become a member of NECA and participate in NECA tariffs and pools.²¹

¹² See Letter from Gerard J. Duffy, Counsel to WeavTel, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, WC Docket No. 05-58 (filed May 13, 2005) (WeavTel Letter).

¹³ WeavTel's waiver request refers to sections 54.301(b), 54.314(d) and 54.903(a). *Id.*

¹⁴ Beaver Creek Petition for Waiver of Sections 69.2 and 69.601 of the Commission's Rules, WC Docket No. 05-69 (filed Dec. 08, 2004) (Beaver Creek Petition); Public Notice, DA 05-593 (rel. Mar. 4, 2005). No comments or reply comments were filed in response to Beaver Creek's petition.

¹⁵ See Beaver Creek Petition at 2.

¹⁶ See *id.* at 3.

¹⁷ See *id.* at 3-4. Verizon Northwest, Inc., is the incumbent LEC adjacent to the proposed Silverton Exchange. Qwest Corporation is the incumbent LEC adjacent to the proposed Devil's Club Exchange.

¹⁸ See *id.* at 5.

¹⁹ See *id.*

²⁰ See *id.*

²¹ See *id.* at 1.

7. On May 13, 2005, Beaver Creek filed a letter in this proceeding stating its intent to seek federal universal service support, and requesting waiver of any sections of Parts 36 and 54 of the Commission's rules necessary for it to be treated as an incumbent LEC for the purposes of imposing access charges and receiving federal universal service support.²² Beaver Creek also requested waiver of certification and data filing deadlines contained in Part 54 of the Commission's rules that would prevent it from beginning to receive high cost loop, local switching, or interstate common line support on the date on which it would otherwise be entitled to receive such support.²³

C. Standards for Waiver

8. Generally, the Commission may waive its rules for good cause shown.²⁴ The Commission may exercise its discretion to waive a rule where the particular facts make strict compliance inconsistent with the public interest.²⁵ In addition, the Commission may take into account considerations of hardship, equity, or more effective implementation of overall policy on an individual basis.²⁶ Waiver of the Commission's rules is therefore appropriate only if special circumstances warrant a deviation from the general rule, and such deviation will serve the public interest.

III. DISCUSSION

A. Waiver Requests

9. We conclude that it is consistent with Commission precedent and the public interest to grant the waivers sought by WeavTel and Beaver Creek, as set forth below. Neither the Commission's rules regarding participation in NECA tariffs and pools nor its rules regarding universal service support for incumbent LECs provide for companies, such as WeavTel and Beaver Creek, that came into existence after the enactment of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.²⁷ Parts 54 and 69 of the Commission's rules define "incumbent LEC" as that term is defined in section 251(h)(1) of the Act.²⁸ Section 251(h)(1), in turn, defines an "incumbent local exchange carrier" as a provider of telephone exchange service and a member of NECA on the date of enactment of the 1996 Act, or a successor or assign of an incumbent

²² See Letter from Gerard J. Duffy, Counsel to Beaver Creek, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, WC Docket No. 05-58 (filed May 13, 2005) (Beaver Creek Letter).

²³ Beaver Creek's waiver request refers to sections 54.301(b), 54.314(d) and 54.903(a). *Id.*

²⁴ 47 C.F.R. § 1.3.

²⁵ *Northeast Cellular Telephone Co. v. FCC*, 897 F.2d 1164, 1166 (D.C. Cir. 1990) (*Northeast Cellular*).

²⁶ *WAIT Radio v. FCC*, 418 F.2d 1153, 1159 (D.C. Cir. 1969) (*WAIT Radio*), *cert. denied*, 409 U.S. 1027 (1972); *Northeast Cellular*, 897 F.2d at 1166.

²⁷ Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996). The Telecommunications Act of 1996 amended the Communications Act of 1934. 47 U.S.C. §§ 151 *et seq.*

²⁸ See 47 C.F.R. §§ 51.5, 54.5, 69.2(hh). Unlike Parts 54 and 69 of the Commission's rules, Part 36 does not include a definition of incumbent LEC. The term "incumbent local exchange carrier" is used throughout Part 36, however, and in some cases references the Commission's definition of rural incumbent LEC in section 54.5 of the Commission's rules. See, e.g., 47 C.F.R. § 36.622(a).

LEC.²⁹ Because WeavTel and Beaver Creek are newly established carriers and are not successors or assigns of an incumbent LEC,³⁰ neither meets the definition of incumbent LEC for purposes of the Act or these rules. In order to be treated as incumbent LECs for purposes of receiving universal service support and imposing access charges, therefore, WeavTel and Beaver Creek seek waiver of these rules.

10. One factor the Commission may consider is whether the requested waiver would result in more effective implementation of overall policy.³¹ Parts 36, 54, and 69 of the Commission's rules identify the amount of universal service support incumbent LECs may receive and regulate the access charges that they may impose. The incumbent LEC restrictions in Parts 36, 54, and 69 distinguish incumbent LECs from competitive carriers for purposes of calculating universal service support and access charges.³² We find that it is consistent with these purposes and the Commission's *2004 Skyline Order*³³ to waive Part 36 and sections 54.5 and 69.2(hh) of the Commission's rules to the limited extent necessary to permit WeavTel and Beaver Creek to be treated as incumbent LECs for purposes of receiving universal service support and participating in the NECA tariffs and pools.³⁴ We further find that WeavTel and Beaver Creek have demonstrated that special circumstances warrant granting the requested waivers.³⁵ Participation in NECA pools will allow WeavTel and Beaver Creek to avoid the costs of filing and maintaining their own company-specific interstate tariffs. Because WeavTel and Beaver Creek are relatively small companies, the costs of preparing company-specific tariffs could be disproportionately high.³⁶

11. We also find that it is consistent with the Bureau's *2005 Skyline Order*³⁷ to waive the October

²⁹ See 47 U.S.C. § 251(h)(1).

³⁰ See WeavTel Petition at 1; Beaver Creek Petition at 1.

³¹ E.g., *WAIT Radio*, 418 F.2d at 1159.

³² For purposes of calculating universal service support, Part 36 of the Commission's rules applies to incumbent LECs, and Part 54 of the Commission's rules distinguishes between incumbent LECs and competitive eligible telecommunications carriers (ETCs). A carrier must be a rural incumbent LEC to receive support based on its own costs. For example, section 36.611 of the Commission's rules governs the submission of data to NECA for purposes of calculating high-cost support and applies only to incumbent LECs. Competitive ETCs file line count data and their support is calculated pursuant to section 54.307 of the Commission's rules. See 47 C.F.R. §§ 36.611, 54.307. In order to be a member of NECA and to participate in the NECA tariffs and pools, a carrier must be an incumbent LEC. See 47 C.F.R. § 69.2(hh).

³³ *M&L Enterprises, Inc., d/b/a Skyline Telephone Company, Petition for Waiver of Sections 36.611, 36.612, and 69.2(hh) of the Commission's Rules*, CC Docket No. 96-45, Order, 19 FCC Rcd 6761, 6766-67, para. 13 (2004) (*2004 Skyline Order*).

³⁴ In the *2004 Skyline Order*, the Commission waived the definition of incumbent LEC in Parts 36, 54, and 69 of the Commission's rules to permit Skyline Telephone to receive high-cost universal service support and to participate in NECA pools and tariffs. See *2004 Skyline Order*, 19 FCC Rcd at 6771-71, paras. 25-28.

³⁵ See *WAIT Radio*, 418 F.2d 1159; *Northeast Cellular*, 897 F.2d at 1166.

³⁶ See WeavTel Petition at 4; Beaver Creek Petition at 5.

³⁷ See *M&L Enterprises, Inc., d/b/a Skyline Telephone Company, Petition for Waiver of Sections 36.611, 36.612, and 69.2(hh) of the Commission's Rules*, CC Docket No. 96-45, Order, 20 FCC Rcd 653 (WCB 2005) (*2005 Skyline Order*).

1, 2004 data filing deadline set forth in section 54.301(b) of the Commission's rules for local switching support (LSS), the October 1, 2004 deadline set forth in section 54.314(d) of the Commission's rules for state certification of support for rural carriers, and the March 31, 2005 and July 31, 2005 data filing deadlines set forth in section 54.903(a) of the Commission's rules for interstate common line support (ICLS).³⁸ Waiver of these deadlines will allow WeavTel and Beaver Creek to begin receiving high cost loop, local switching, and interstate common line support on the dates they would otherwise be entitled to receive such support, absent the waived requirements.³⁹ These waivers serve the public interest in promoting universal service by helping to bring the benefits and conveniences of telecommunications to currently unserved areas.⁴⁰

12. Accordingly, we waive sections 69.2(hh) and 69.601 of the Commission's rules in order to allow WeavTel and Beaver Creek to participate in NECA tariffs and pools,⁴¹ and we waive the definition of incumbent LEC in Part 36 and section 54.5 of the Commission's rules to the limited extent necessary to permit WeavTel and Beaver Creek to receive universal service support.⁴² We also waive the October 1, 2004 data filing deadline set forth in section 54.301(b), the October 1, 2004 deadline for state certification of support for rural carriers set forth in section 54.314(d), and the March 31, 2005 and July 31, 2005 data filing deadlines set forth in section 54.903(a) of the Commission's rules.

B. Study Area Waiver

13. The Commission froze all study area boundaries effective November 15, 1984 to prevent the establishment of high-cost exchanges within existing service territories as separate study areas merely to maximize high-cost support.⁴³ A carrier must therefore apply to the Commission for a waiver of the study area boundary freeze if it wishes to sell or purchase additional exchanges.⁴⁴ In the *Study Area*

³⁸ Section 54.904 of the Commission's rules requires that carriers desiring to receive ICLS must file an annual certification that such support will be used as *intended* on the date that it first files its line count data pursuant to section 54.903. 47 C.F.R. § 54.904.

³⁹ In the *2005 Skyline Order*, the Wireline Competition Bureau, on its own motion, waived state certification and data filing deadlines contained in sections 54.301(b), 54.314(d), 54.903(a) of the Commission's rules to allow Skyline Telephone to receive high-cost universal service support beginning in 2004, consistent with the Commission's intent in the *2004 Skyline Order*. See *2005 Skyline Order*, 20 FCC Rcd at 655, para. 7.

⁴⁰ The Commission and the Bureau have granted similar waivers in the past. See, e.g., *2005 Skyline Order*, 20 FCC Rcd at 657, para. 10; *In the Matter of Sandwich Isles Communications, Inc., Petition For Waiver of Section 36.611 of the Commission's Rules and Request for Clarification*, AAD File No. 97-82, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 19 FCC Rcd 22268 (2004); *2004 Skyline Order*, 19 FCC Rcd at 6772, paras. 29 - 31; *Petition For Waiver of Section 36.611 of the Commission's Rules and Request for Clarification*, AAD File No. 97-82, Order, 13 FCC Rcd 2407 (Acct. Aud. Div. 1998).

⁴¹ 47 C.F.R. §§ 69.2(hh), 69.601.

⁴² 47 C.F.R. Part 36, § 54.5.

⁴³ See *MTS and WATS Market Structure, Amendment of Part 67 of the Commission's Rules and Establishment of a Joint Board*, CC Docket Nos. 78-72, 80-286, Decision and Order, 50 Fed. Reg. 939 (1985) (*Part 67 Order*), adopting Recommended Decision and Order, 49 Fed. Reg. 48325 (1984). See also 47 C.F.R. Part 36, App. A study area is a geographic segment of an incumbent LEC's telephone operations. Generally, a study area corresponds to an incumbent LEC's entire service territory within a state.

⁴⁴ See *Part 67 Order*, 50 Fed. Reg. at 939.

Waiver Exceptions Order,⁴⁵ the Common Carrier Bureau held that carriers are not required to seek study area waivers if: (1) a separately incorporated company is establishing a study area for a previously unserved area; (2) a company is combining previously unserved territory with one of its existing study areas in the same state; or (3) a holding company is consolidating existing study areas in the same state.⁴⁶ In the *2004 Skyline Order*, the Commission clarified that a carrier must apply for a study area waiver if it seeks to create a new study area within one or more existing study areas.⁴⁷ The record demonstrates that the areas in which WeavTel and Beaver Creek intend to construct and operate new exchanges are not within the study area of any incumbent LEC.⁴⁸ Accordingly, because WeavTel and Beaver Creek do not intend to create a new study area from within one or more existing study areas,⁴⁹ and because they are separately incorporated companies establishing study areas for previously unserved areas, no study area waivers are required to establish new study areas for their proposed exchanges.

C. Other Matters

14. On May 11, 2001, the Commission adopted an order requiring incumbent LECs to freeze, on an interim basis, the Part 36 jurisdictional separations factors beginning July 1, 2001.⁵⁰ In that order, the Commission addressed the recalculation of frozen allocation factors when a carrier converts from average schedule-based interstate settlements to cost-based interstate settlements.⁵¹ In those circumstances, the carrier has not previously performed cost studies to separate certain types of costs. To address this issue, the Commission provided that rate-of-return carriers that convert from average schedule to cost company status during the freeze “shall calculate new factors based on the twelve-month period immediately following the conversion and then freeze the new factors for the remainder of the freeze.”⁵² Similarly, because WeavTel and Beaver Creek have not previously performed such cost

⁴⁵ See *Request for Clarification Filed by the National Exchange Carrier Association, Inc., and Petitions for Waiver Filed by Alaska Telephone Company, Ducor Telephone Company, and Kingsgate Telephone, Inc., Concerning the Definition of “Study Area” in the Part 36 Appendix-Glossary of the Commission’s Rules*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, AAD 95-175, AAD 96-29, AAD 96-51, 11 FCC Rcd 8156, 8160, para. 9 (Com. Car. Bur. 1996) (*Study Area Waiver Exceptions Order*), erratum, 11 FCC Rcd 8646 (Acct. Aud. Div. 1996). The Common Carrier Bureau is now known as the Wireline Competition Bureau (Bureau).

⁴⁶ See *Study Area Waiver Exceptions Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 8160, para. 9.

⁴⁷ See *2004 Skyline Order*, 19 FCC Rcd at 6766-67, para. 13.

⁴⁸ See WeavTel Petition at 3; Beaver Creek Petition at 4; see also Letter from Carole J. Washburn, Executive Secretary, Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, WC Docket No. 05-58 (filed April 29, 2005); Letter from Carole J. Washburn, Executive Secretary, Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, WC Docket No. 05-69 (filed May 3, 2005). The Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission stated that neither WeavTel’s proposed Stehekin exchange nor Beaver Creek’s proposed Devil’s Club or Silverton exchanges are located within any incumbent LEC’s study area.

⁴⁹ See *Study Area Waiver Exception Order*, 11 FCC Rcd at 8160, para. 9.

⁵⁰ See *Jurisdictional Separations and Referral to the Federal-State Joint Board*, Report and Order, CC Docket No. 80-286, 16 FCC Rcd 11382 (2001) (*Separations Freeze Order*).

⁵¹ See *id.* at 11406, n.123.

⁵² See *id.* at para. 53.

studies, it is appropriate to apply the same requirement to them, thus "eliminating the need for waiver requests to calculate new factors"⁵³ Specifically, WeavTel and Beaver Creek are required for the first twelve months of operation to categorize the telecommunications plant and expenses and develop separations factors in accordance with the separations procedures in effect as of December 31, 2000.⁵⁴

IV. ORDERING CLAUSES

15. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED, pursuant to sections 1, 4(i), 5(c), 201, 202, and 254 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), 155(c), 201, 202, and 254, and sections 0.91, 0.291, and 1.3 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.91, 0.291, and 1.3, that the petitions for waiver of sections 69.2(hh) and 69.601 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 69.2(hh), 69.601, filed by Westgate Communications LLC d/b/a WeavTel on August 18, 2004 and by Beaver Creek Telephone Company on December 8, 2004 ARE GRANTED, as described herein.

16. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, pursuant to sections 1, 4(i), 5(c), 201, 202, and 254 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), 155(c), 201, 202, and 254, and sections 0.91, 0.291, and 1.3 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.91, 0.291, and 1.3, that waivers of the definition of "incumbent local exchange carrier" in Part 36 and section 54.5 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. Part 36, §54.5, ARE GRANTED to Westgate Communications LLC d/b/a WeavTel and to Beaver Creek Telephone Company for the limited purposes described in paragraph 12 herein.

17. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, pursuant to sections 1, 4(i), 4(j), and 254 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), 154(j), and 254, and sections 0.91, 0.291, and 1.3 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.91, 0.291, and 1.3, that waivers of the October 1, 2004 data filing deadline set forth in section 54.301(b) of the Commission's rules, the October 1, 2004 deadline set forth in section 54.314(d) of the Commission's rules for state certification of support for rural carriers, and the March 31, 2005 and July 31, 2005 data filing deadlines set forth in section 54.903(a) of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 54.301(b), 54.314(d), and 54.903(a), ARE GRANTED to Westgate Communications LLC d/b/a WeavTel and to Beaver Creek Telephone Company as described herein.

⁵³ See *id.*

⁵⁴ See 47 C.F.R. § 36.3(e).

18. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, pursuant to sections 1, 4(i), 4(j), and 254 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), 154(j), and 254, and sections 0.91, 0.291, and 1.3 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.91, 0.291, and 1.3, that, for the first twelve months of operation, Westgate Communications LLC d/b/a WeavTel and Beaver Creek Telephone Company ARE REQUIRED to develop and use separation factors as described herein.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION



Thomas J. Navin
Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau